THE BEREAN.

"These were more noble than those of Thessalonica, in that they received the WORD *with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so."—"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."*—Acts, xvii. 11. Thes v. 21.

NEW SERIES. } VOL. I. } **WILMINGTON, DEL., 11TH. MO. 1827.** [No. 2.

PRINTED FOR THE EDITOR, AT No. 103, SHIPLEY-STREET.

The present state of religious Society.

(Continued from p. 8.)

We had occasion, in our last number, to advert to some of the proceedings of the Meeting for Sufferings. We are now to notice a pamphlet issued by that Meeting, dated in the seventh month last, entitled, "An Epistle to the members of the religious Society of Friends belonging to the Yearly Meeting" &c. In this pamphlet the authors have made a vain attempt to fix upon their opponents (which constitute more than *three fourths* of the Yearly Meeting) the character of schismatics and disorganizers, and thus to identify them, with those of this stamp who disturbed the Society in its beginning. "Those," they say, "who both secretly, and openly have designed and been endeavouring to cause divisions among us, taking upon them the station and office of leaders to a party, have with others of like dispositions, assiduously disseminated opinions and doctrines which we have never owned, and have sought by gross misrepresentations to fasten upon the minds of those who have not had the opportunity of more correct information, the most unfounded calumnies and aspersions of the characters of Friends, who have with sincerity devoted great part of their lives to the cause of Truth, and the service of our religious Society." *p.* 13.

In this sketch the authors have in several particulars, drawn, in a very striking manner their own likeness, and that of the "party" of which they have taken "the station and office of leaders." The ruling members in the Meeting for Sufferings, constituted the first "party," and gave rise to the first "divisions amongst us"; and having found others "of like dispositions" in most of the country meetings, they have extended those divisions throughout the Yearly Meeting, and to this moment these men continue to exercise the "office of leaders" to the "party." In company with their co-adjutors from the degenerate branch of the Society in Europe, they have preached "opinions and doctrines" in our meetings, "which we have never owned," in this country; and they have "sought by gross misrepresentations," not only through the medium of the press, but *in the sacred character of ministers of the gospel, in public meetings held for the purpose of divine worship*, to asperse "the characters of Friends, and to denounce them in the strongest terms, thereby encouraging and extending a system of detraction and scandal, destructive of charity; of the peace and tranquility of Society, the social relations, and the purposes of religious communion. For the truth of these remarks, we confidently appeal to *three fourths* of the Society of Friends in our Yearly Meeting. The pamphlet goes on to say:

"They have also lately, in a variety of instances, very disgraceful to a religious community, exhibited several unjust accusations against our Yearly Meeting; thus striving, in an insidious manner, so effectually to sow the seeds of prejudice, discord and contention among our members, as to advance themselves, and, in violation of our well known order, to procure the holding of several meetings in different parts of the country, adapted to their preconcerted purpose, of an entire division and separation of our religious Society. Having also had a number of meetings of that character in this city, they have issued two publications the drift of which is, to prevail upon our members to withdraw from our regularly established meetings, and unite with them in the schism and opposition which they

are now engaged in. Although they have attempted to cover their real designs, it is evident that a difference in principles and doctrines from the Society of Friends, and a thirst for unlimited liberty, are the original and leading motives for their separation. Persons desirous of indulging in an extensive range of speculative opinions and notions, and who cherish a fondness for the estimation of the people, as authors or inventors of new theories, are apt to be so pleased with their own conceptions and performances, that they cannot calmly submit to the wholesome restraints of a well established order and discipline; hence, if they cannot be the most conspicuous, active members in meetings, not being willing to hearken to advice or admonition, they are often urged on to the sad alternative of complete insubordination.

"Such are the mis-statements and contradictions in those addresses, that they might be easily refuted, but as we are not disposed to enter into a particular examination of them, we will only observe, that the reflections upon our Society, and the odium attempted to be cast upon the Yearly Meeting, are without foundation. Had they cherished a due regard for candour; for the testimony of hundreds of witnesses who were present at the Yearly Meeting, and more especially if they had any real sense of 'the covering wing of ancient goodness,' they certainly could not have ventured to assert that the clerk was imposed upon the meeting; for although there was much clamour and indecorous behaviour of a number, who had previously been planning a division and disorginization of the Society, he was the deliberate and settled choice of the meeting. The appointment of a committee to visit the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings, though at first occasioning some hesitation in the minds of several Friends, as the Meeting had advanced so far towards its conclusion, yet after being carefully and impartially weighed, it was solidly united with, and we fully believe that it was under divine direction. It is true, that a considerable, though not the 'largest number of the members in attendance,' objected to this appointment, for they must have seen that it would be likely to obstruct the current of their schemes and plans for the dismemberment of the Yearly Meeting."

The authors, in the above quotation, have, in a manner "very disgraceful," brought against Friends a number of railing accusations which are without foundation; but time and events are effectually developing the truth, and rending the flimsy vail with which they endeavour to conceal the real state of things.

It has been the policy of the Meeting for Sufferings, and its partizans, to represent those opposed to their proceedings as comparatively small in numbers, light in character, and of no depth in religious experience; such would be the inference of some readers after perusing this pamphlet and such are the impressions intended to be made on the public mind. In contradiction of all this we need only refer to the Meeting held in the preceeding month in Philadelphia. The number and weight of character of the members attending that Meeting; the harmony and solemnity that reigned at its sittings, and the prominent features of its proceedings and acts—all must have convinced the unprejudiced mind that this body is the Yearly Meeting of Pennsylvania, brought by the blessed head of the church, through a tempestuous and trying period, and placed on its ancient foundation. As such it is already acknowledged by the Baltimore Yearly Meeting, in the welcome reception of its Epistle by that body; and as such there is every reason to believe from what has already appeared, it will be acknowledged by most of the Yearly Meetings on this continent.

To the accusations contained in this pamphlet, we think it unnecessary, therefore, to take any further notice, at present; but there are two *assertions* found in it, which cannot be adverted to without calling in question the *veracity* of the authors. Men may accuse wrongfully, and misrepresent grossly; and charity which "believeth all things," and "hopeth all things," may cast its heavenly mantle over them, and leave their *motives* unimpeached. But when assertions are made in contradiction to plain *matters of fact*, even charity discovers its limits, and leaves rebuke to do its office. These strictures refer to the declaration, that the clerk "*was the deliberate and settled choice of the meeting*," and that the "Committee to visit the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings"—"after being carefully and impartially weighed, *it was solidly united with*." Believing that further comment can add nothing to the force of the im-

pression which these assertions must make upon the minds of many Friends who witnessed the transaction, or assist their convictions we shall close this article with the address of the late Yearly Meeting to its members.

(The Address will be given in our next.)

"THE BURIAL."

Nothing more effectually perverts the judgment and misleads the mind, than prejudice and party spirit. Where these have gained an ascendency, truth itself appears as falsehood, while error assumes the garb of truth. In no case do they exert more prejudicial influence, than when connected with the subject of religion and the affairs of religious associations. The asperity with which they are commonly accompanied, not only indisposes to the perception of truth, but when perceived, this morbid feeling too often prompts its unhappy subject to endeavour to obscure and pervert it, that it may not be perceived by others.

Feelings of this kind seem to have elicited various communications published lately in Philadelphia. Any individual unacquainted with the facts, might really suppose, from these recent publications that the name of ELIAS HICKS was synonymous with every thing like confusion and disorder. Does a Monthly Meeting assert the powers given to it by the Discipline, so as to defeat the views of a certain party—Elias Hicks is to blame! Do a number of Quarterly Meetings, wearied with the arbitrary measures pursued by a minority, who, having the clerk on their side, endeavour to *make themselves* the Yearly Meeting, withdraw from contention and meet together in "the unity of the spirit, which is the bond of peace"—they are "Hicksites"! Does an individual who holds an important trust, in the fulfilment of his duty as trustee, and in accordance with the laws of the land, but thwart the views and designs of those who "lord it over God's heritage"—he must of course be "a follower of Elias Hicks"!—Herculean indeed ought to be the shoulders of this aged patriarch to bear the burden of all the sins imputed to him!! It is truly ludicrous to see the name of Elias Hicks thus introduced on every occasion! It is not difficult, however, to account for the circumstance. The would be rulers and their partizans in Philadelphia—a mere *handful* compared with the rest of the Society—conscious, it would seem, that they have little else but *the name*, are determined to appropriate exclusively to themselves the title of *The Society of Friends*, and as the most convenient way of establishing their claim they must stigmatize the great mass of the Society as "the followers of Elias Hicks"!!! But while we reject as slander the application of any such epithets, it is a little unfortunate for this party, that the name of Elias Hicks conveys no reproach. The good sense of the Society has justly associated it with attributes of a very different character—attributes which have been acquired by more than half a century spent in the practice of every manly and Christian virtue. This fact I presume his opposers have by this time discovered to their no small disappointment They have found that the odium which they have so industriously endeavoured to cast upon that great and good man has reverted on themselves. Seldom, perhaps, has the truth of the old adage been more strikingly exemplified than in this case, "Let envy alone and it will punish itself."

With what pretence to fairness, then, do these writers complain of "misrepresentations"? If the complaint be just, it is evident, that the application may with great truth be made to themselves. And more peculiarly inappropriate is their complaint respecting Friends in the country. If "the mischievous effects of misrepresentations are lamentably obvious," among them, they ought to blame themselves and their party for it. They have long laboured industriously and "with a zeal worthy a better cause," in the vocation of spreading "misrepresentations," in the shape of anonymous pamphlets, reviews, memoirs, &c. &c. But it not unfrequently happens that in the anxiety to promote our views we forget common prudence. Of this fact they furnish

us numerous examples. The compliment they pay to *country Friends*, "whose sources of information are very few," will be easily understood and duly appreciated!

Hitherto *Philadelphia Friends* have had the power of dictating and directing pretty much the whole concerns of Society; but by some unaccountable circumstance, the last Yearly Meeting opened "sources of information" to Country Friends, by which they seem to have greatly profited! And as the party find that their proceedings in Philadelphia, at a late circumstance, have produced impressions different from what they expected, they are labouring to counteract their effects by further "misrepresentations." That these proceedings which have lacerated the kindest feelings of humanity, and against which the house of mourning has proved no sanctuary—should produce impressions unfavourable to the promoters of them, is not at all astonishing. I allude to the proceedings of what are termed the Orthodox party in Philadelphia, in preference to the burial of a deceased member of a Monthly Meeting of Friends of *Green Street*, and not "a member of the Northern District Monthly Meeting."

In most arguments it is very convenient to assume certain principles as fixed and immutable, and where both parties agree to them they furnish legitimate ground for deduction. But it happens in this case, that we differ at the threshhold. While the orthodox party finds it best to suit their views to assume it as a fact that Green Street Monthly Meeting has been dissolved, I take the liberty of asserting that the Monthly Meeting of Friends held at Green Street, Philadelphia, still continues to exist in the unimpaired exercise of all its powers, and held according to the order of Society. And as evidence of my assertion I refer to their own admissions, that Green Street Monthly Meeting "applied to and was received as a component part of Abington Quarter," and also to the minutes of that Quarterly Meeting. All their deductions, therefore, being predicated on a false assumption, fall of themselves.

It is true, that Green Street Monthly Meeting "was a branch of Philadelphia Quarterly Meeting," and "subordinate" to it *in the Discipline*, "the compact agreed to by both parties," and therefore not unconditionally subject. It is also true that Green Street Monthly Meeting "declared itself independent of Philadelphia Quarterly Meeting," and was received as a branch of Abington Quarter; and all this for sufficient reasons, and without any "violation of the Discipline." But is it pretended that by this connexion Abington Quarterly Meeting acquired any title to the property of Green Street Monthly Meeting? Nothing like it. Abington Quarterly Meeting has as little claim of this kind as Philadelphia Quarterly Meeting; and I would ask, by what kind of legerdemain Philadelphia Quarterly Meeting has acquired a right to the possession of the property of Green Street Monthly Meeting, whether special, or that held by joint tenure? When this question is answered, I may have a few more queries to put in relation to this subject.

We are told that "the trustees have no more control over the property than the deeds which record the conveyance." I will ask for what purpose then are they constituted trustees? It happens that I have at the time of writing this, a copy of the deed of conveyance, of the joint property taken from the record office lying before me, from which I may, at a future period, give this party some more information than they appear to possess. A short extract will at present suffice.

After describing the property, it proceeds, that it "be conveyed to fifteen friends as trustees, three of whom to be appointed by each of the *five* Monthly Meetings of Friends, commonly called Quakers, in Philadelphia, including that held at Green Street aforesaid, to be held by such *trustees and their heirs*, for and on behalf and for *the use and benefit of the five Monthly Meetings* of Friends, commonly called Quakers, in Philadelphia, including *that held at Green Street* aforesaid."

From this it appears that it is held for the *use and benefit* of the *five* Monthly Meet-

ings in Philadelphia. Now suppose that the Quarterly Meeting of Philadelphia should see meet, in its wisdom, to lay down all the five Monthly Meetings, without their consent, as we are told they have the power to do, what in that case becomes of the property? I find no provision in the title papers that would give Philadelphia Quarter more right to it than Abington Quarter. On the principle upon which their reasoning is based, a few individuals in this city might treat the other Monthly Meetings belonging to Philadelphia Quarter, in the same way that they have treated Green Street Monthly Meeting, and then lay claim to the property both in city and country!

So far from the trustees having "no more control over the property than the Deeds which record the conveyance," they are the only persons that have any legal control over it. And in such a case as the one at issue they are bound to see that the rights of a Monthly Meeting for which they hold in trust the property are not invaded. A few individual had undertaken to prevent the use of the property as specified in the deed of trust, under the pretext that Green Street Monthly Meeting had ceased to exist. It became, therefore, the duty of the trustees to interfere, and as the point was a disputed one, to see that both parties had access to the property till such time as it should be decided which party, if either, had forfeited their claim. Nor could they be exempted from this obligation until it should be decided that the meeting for which they held this trust had forfeited its claim.

In the late painful case, the committee of the Monthly Meeting of Green Street that stand appointed for the purpose, was requested to grant an order for the interment of one of their members. This was done; but in consequence of previous instruction given to the grave digger by part of the joint committees who have the care of the Burial grounds, but who are not trustees, he *refused to open the ground.* It is true that some Friends of the Northern District Monthly Meeting did use great exertions to induce the relations of the deceased to accept *their order* But this was declined, and one of the trustees for Green Street Monthly Meeting was called on to see that the rights of that Meeting were maintained. This he did—and the interment took place. It is obvious from this simple narrative of facts, that the trustee for Green Street Monthly Meeting could not have done other than he did. He was bound to see that the burial ground was appropriated to "the use and benefit" of the Monthly Meeting "held at Green Street," equally with the other four Monthly Meetings "in Philadelphia." To fail in the discharge of this duty, so long as a single member of Green Street Monthly Meeting claimed the exercise of its rights, would be to render himself liable to impeachment for a violation of his trust. And in the fulfilment of this obligation he had not only a perfect right "to draw a staple" or wrench a lock, but, if he could not otherwise enter the yard, to make a sufficient opening in the wall.

It may not be unimportant here to remark, that previous to the interment, the trustee for Green Street Meeting called on four other trustees, all members of other Monthly Meetings, who joined in giving a written order to open the ground.

But these writers can see no occasion for all this temerity on the part of the members of Green Street, not to receive orders for interment from a committee of the Northern District Meeting. "No principle," we are told, "would have been compromitted by so doing." If so, why this extreme desire to force such acceptance on the family? Could not the chamber of death protect from the cold calculating prudence which recognized in the efforts to maintain the rights of Green Street Monthly Meeting, a step that might be destructive to the position taken by our opposing brethren? Where was the "sad and subdued feeling which the dissolution of a fellow being was calculated to produce," of which we have heard? Why did not this "calm the tumult of party feeling, and hush every unkind and angry emotion"? Why did it not restrain a certain member of the Northern District Meeting, when he called on the fath the deceased to pro-

cure the acceptance of an order from that meeting—why did it not restrain the member from attempting to alarm the family with apprehensions of a disturbance at the burial?—Was a disposition entertained to oppose the introduction of the corpse into the grave yard? If not, why this appeal to the feelings of the relatives!

We are told that a certain friend went out to the burial ground, and informed the person engaged in digging, "that as one of the committee employed to have the care of the property, it was his duty to forbid his digging the grave." But it is not shown that this individual had any more right to do so, than any one of the remaining nine members of that committee had to direct him to proceed. The truth is, he had just as much right to do it, as *eight* of the "committee of *ten*" had to exclude the other *two* from their board; and that was altogether an *assumed* right—a right not conferred by any competent authority—a right exercised by men *determined at all hazards to retain the power in their own hands.*

In relation to the "disorderly meetings" which it is as asserted have been held at Green Street, I am willing to say, there has been but one meeting of that discription within my recollection, and that one was made disorderly by the conduct of individuals of the opposite party, not members of that particular meeting, and who had come there to interfere with its business.

But it is stated that the "dignity and authority of the Quarterly Meeting," required the course taken. For information on this part of the subject, I am willing to refer the reader to "A statement of Facts, exhibiting the causes that have led to the dissolution of the connection which existed between Philadelphia Quarterly Meeting and the Monthly Meeting of Friends, held at Green Street, Philadelphia," lately issued by the Monthly Meeting. There may be seen the first wrong step, taken by the parties opposed to Green Street Monthly Meeting, and which has required all the subsequent proceedings *to be consistent with it!*

The charge of interfering with the concerns of Philadelphia Quarter, since the dissolution of the connexion of Green Street Monthly Meeting with that Quarter, is entirely without foundation. I will venture to assert, that not one member of Green Street has ever opened his lips in that Quarter, to oppose or interfere with its business, since that event took place. Wholesale denunciations are not unfrequently resorted to, where facts and sound reasoning fail.

TRUTH.

A LETTER

Addressed to the female ministers of the Society of Friends in England, who are now travelling in that capacity in the U. States.

Respected Friends,—When delicate females, actuated by a sense of religious obligation, burst asunder the endearing ties of family, friends and country, and encounter the perils of the winds and waves, to sound the Gospel trumpet in a distant, foreign land, it presents considerations calculated to conciliate all minds; to excite the benevolent affections, to awaken sympathies, however torpid, and to make salutary impressions, even on obdurate hearts.

Now, when, with these circumstances in view, we take a survey of the state of feeling prevalent among, by much the larger portion of, the members of this Yearly Meeting, towards you and your ministry, after but a short period from your landing on our shores:—a feeling that has closed your way to profitable service, and imparted to your meetings a savour of death; a voice that sounds to your hearers as "the voice of a stranger," which they will not follow; and when we reflect, too, that these unexpected results have taken place amongst a people, who have not been thought wanting in the benevolent affections,—we are led to inquire after the causes of this unnatural, and almost unprecedented state of things.

The report of the controversy which had disturbed the peace of the Society, had reached England, long before the

last of your number left that country. More than one female minister of note, had already visited us from thence, and having more zeal than prudence, had been deeply entangled in it, with the effect only of increasing our difficulties, and inflicting new wounds. These had transmitted to their friends at home such an account no doubt of our affairs, and of the nature and character of the controversy, as zealous partizans would be likely to furnish. This, whilst it added to prejudice already deeply rooted, stirred up new zeal; and two more ministers took shipping, and arrived in Philadelphia about the 18th. of the 9th. month 1826.

An acute writer has observed that "There is no cruelty so inexorable and unrelenting as that which proceeds from a bigoted and presumptuous supposition of doing service to God. Under the influence of such hallucination, all common modes of reasoning are perverted, and all general principles distroyed. The victim of the fanatical persecutor will find that the stronger the motives he can urge for mercy are, the weaker will be his chance of obtaining it." I do not apply these remarks to your condition, but leave the reader to judge: but you came amongst us, not as "a healer of breaches," neither "in love," if we may judge from an attack on one of our female ministers, in a public meeting in Philadelphia, a very short time after the last arrival.

It was on the third of the tenth month 1826, one of you preached at the North Meeting, Philadelphia; when, after the close of her sermon, the female minister alluded to above, rose and expressed her unity with the sentiments that had been delivered. The husband of the first then spoke, and the same female, approbated, in an unexceptionable manner, his communication also; after which one of you stood up, and addressed the meeting nearly as follows:

"There is a likeness in Babylon of every thing that is found in Zion, but we must not mistake the likeness for the reality. It is with reluctance that I have risen to express, what may appear to be opposition to an individual about whom I know but little, except that I have heard her several times in the meetings that I have attended. But I cannot leave this meeting in peace, without bearing my testimony against that deceitful spirit, that says one thing at one time, and another thing at another time. I have heard this person, at some former meetings, say things, that I deem irreverent, profane and even blasphemous. And as it has been wished to be represented, that we are in fellowship, I cannot leave this meeting without publicly declaring that I have no fellowship with her, and testify against that specious and deceitful spirit, which under the show of speaking in the name of the Lord, blasphemes God and his son Jesus Christ. I have said, 'My soul, come not thou into their secret, unto their assembly, mine honour be not thou united, for the instruments of cruelty are in their habitations.'" Then without seating herself took her bonnet and beckoning to her husband to break up the meeting, immediately left the house, in order to deprive the injured woman of an opportunity to reply.

Now in this case, the strongest motives for forbearance existed. The person attacked was a "stranger" to her: she was a recommended minister, and in that respect stood on equal ground with herself; and the order and discipline of the Society forbad an open and public opposition, in such a case. But this was not a mere opposition, but a charge against a sister, a fellow member, and minister, of one of the highest offences in the catalogue of crimes; that of *Blasphemy* punishable in some countries, and in her own, with fine, imprisonment, and the pillory. Added to this, the ground of the charge was not stated, and by breakng up the Meeting deprived her of an opportunity of self-defence. She was, moreover, refused a hearing afterwards: nor has any satisfaction ever been made either to herself or to the Society, for this act, the most reprehensible and disorderly in a minister, of any one that had ever occurred, to our knowledge, in a public Meeting in the Society of Friends, on this continent, or in any other country.

SCRUTINY.

(To be continued.)

FOR THE BEREAN.

ON THE CHARACTER AND MISSION OF JESUS CHRIST.

(Continued from p. 11)

We need not desire a better evidence, that any man is in the wrong, than to hear him declare against reason, and thereby to acknowledge that reason is against him.

Some men seem to think, that they please God by believing plain contradictions; but the matter is quite otherwise. He that made man a reasonable creature, cannot take it kindly from any man to debase his workmanship by making himself unreasonable.

Did not God give us our reason? Has not the inspiration of the Almighty imparted to us understanding? If then, "the spirit of man is the candle of the Lord," shall we suppose he lighted it up in vain? Yet in vain it is, in the most important of all our concerns, if our understanding be not capable of drawing any correct conclusion in religious matters, from a careful examination and comparison of nature and revelation. We always find in our Lord's discourses, powerful appeals to the *understandings* and consciences of his hearers; and how shall we account that Jesus Christ rested the proof of his divine mission on the sense of the Jews upon the Scriptures? It is often the consciousness of the absurdity of their opinions that makes men exclaim against reason. Priestcraft is wholly built upon the principle, that reason is depraved. When a man can once be persuaded that the Great Creator of the Universe wishes him to believe what is incomprehensible and impossible, he might ust as well be deprived of his reason altogether, and become as an idiot, or a brute.

That result in the mind, therefore, which is termed belief, if it be true at all, is moral suasion. Every private Christian is a priest to himself, though he may not be qualified to be a priest, or a teacher to others.

The legitimate objects of reason however, ought to be well understood; and although no position can be clearer, than that we cannot believe what is not made known to us either by the light of revelation or the deductions of reason, yet the mind may sometimes through presumption or ignorance, attempt to stretch the limits of reason to points which it was never intended to reach. A *miracle* is above, but strictly consistent with, reason. It is certainly rational to believe that an Almighty Being can perform a miracle, either mediately or without instrumental and secondary means. But if a man should attempt to deny a miracle, well attested, simply because he does not comprehend the manner of its operation, he betrays great ignorance of his subject, and perversion of his reason. It is the miracle itself—the *fact*, he is called to believe, not the "how" it is done. The great operations of nature—even the growth of a blade of grass—also the union of the soul with the body, and their mutual operation on each other, may be considered standing miracles; but he surely must be very weak who would deny the *facts*, merely because he did not understand the *modes*. There are well attested truths exhibiting extraordinary revelations of the Divine will to particular individuals, giving them information which they could receive in no other way but by *direct* communication. The mode may be hidden, but the fact, being strictly consistent with reason, may readily be believed. None of these observations can however apply to a mere hypothesis, or system which is *supposed* to exist. It behoves those who call on us to believe it, to prove that it is a *fact*. And especially can we properly withhold our assent, if it be contrary to reason, contradictory in itself, or inconsistent with the known plan of creation.

With regard to mysteries, it is very properly said, that we must use our reason to find out how many and what they are; so it may be argued, that it is every Christian's duty to be inquiring, if it be only to discover where inquiry is needless and may cease.

It is too common to cry out against the freedom of criticism in relation to the Holy Scriptures—some superstitiously deeming them *so holy*, that not a tittle of them is to be subjected to the decisions of

the understanding, however enlightened. In monkish days, this silly assertion might have claimed the indolent or credulous assent of degraded minds. But that dark hour, we trust, has passed away. If the freedom in biblical criticism, of which Luther and other conspicuous reformers set the example, had been followed by the advocates of the Reformation down to the present times, the cause of learning, knowledge, and truth, would have made much greater progress, though it is most probable that some opinions which are now popular would have been ranked by common consent amongst the errors which *once* debased the human mind. Prejudice, the almost uninterrupted growth of several centuries, like ivy which conceals the sculpture of an ancient building, prevents a proper view of it.

How is it that Christians exclude human judgment; and yet admit it, by translating the scriptures in different ways agreeably to their own ideas, and after all referring to human judgment for the authority of accuracy? How could men decide which translation of the Bible is correct, if human judgment be insufficient? Religion should be freed from all those absurd and contradictory doctrines which give infidel principles all their weight and importance.

Revelation and reason both teach us the great truth of the existence of God. We cannot rest, till, from a chain of dependent causes or beings, we arrive at some *one*, who is absolutely uncaused, independent, and possessed of all possible perfections; and in the contemplation of this adorable Essence, the mind is at rest, and inquires no farther; for what can it wish or desire more than *all?* That glorious and beneficent Being, in his gracious wisdom, communicated his will, through the inspiration of his Holy Spirit in the minds of his prophets and holy men of old, as recorded in the Bible. To it we may appeal for the decision of our religious practice. For it would be unreasonable and inconsistent to suppose that the Almighty would communicate by his eternally unchangeable spirit, indications of his will externally, for the moral government of his creatures formerly, which would not be correspondent with similar revelations of his truth in the hearts of his people in every age. "The Bible," therefore, as was said by Chillingworth,—"the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants." (Or rather it is the test of religious *practices*.) As Christians, we believe that the Bible contains authentic records of the revelations which at different times it has pleased the Almighty to make, of his will to mankind. But here it may be remarked, that as the Bible partakes with other books, of the imperfections of misconstruction and mistranslation, we do not consider it a test of the *doctrines* of religion, more especially while we have a true standard to refer to, even that spirit which is superior to all scripture, and from which the writings we dignify by the title of the "holy scriptures," proceeded. And that it cannot be considered a test of religious doctrines or opinions, is very evident, when we reflect that it is the authority of all the conflicting opinions and controversies which have so long divided the Christian world—each sect claiming from it, the basis of the peculiar creed which is deemed *the only true belief!* Far be it from us to detract from the true use of these invaluable writings; but the maxim, "That for which a thing is such, the thing itself is more such," strictly applies to that Spirit which gave these writings forth; and it must be manifest, even to those who argue for the *plenary* inspiration of the scriptures, that unless the mind of the reader be illuminated by the same Spirit, much of what he reads will be dark and intricate.

Let us turn to these writings, one of the most precious external gifts to man, and see in them a narrative of the gracious dealings of the Lord with his people, from the first ages of the world. They are a record of revelation to others, not revelations to ourselves.

A peculiar beauty of the Scriptures, which cannot fail to strike the most careless observer, is the connection displayed of types and figures with the realities which they represent.

In them we read of the appearance on earth of *Jesus Christ* of Nazareth, "a man approved of God, (among the Jews

of that day) by miracles, and wonders, and signs, *which God did by him* in the midst of them." Acts 2. 22. In them we read also of "Christ in us, the hope of glory." Colos. 1. 27.

It is evident that these two could not have been the same—an external, visible being, mortal, subject to the infirmities of human nature, sleep, weariness, hunger and thirst, and an internal, invisible principle, which, living, elevating and purifying amidst the darkness and corruptions of mortality, is the means, and emphatically the *hope* of future glory! One was a type of the other. And we think that many of the disputes which have prevailed in different ages in respect to the person and mission of Christ, have arisen from the want of a careful discrimination of those passages of the Scriptures which severally relate to the type and antitype.

The word Christ is derived from the Greek, Christos, anointed, and the operation of the Holy Spirit is called in the Scriptures *Chrisma*—unction or anointing, 1 John, 2. 20, and therefore Jesus the Christ simply means Jesus the anointed. In the Scriptures it is used with various meanings. It is synonimous with the Holy Spirit—the Gospel—Jesus—the wisdom and power of God—the law of God written in the heart. It is highly necessary therefore, when we meet with this word in the Sacred Writings, to make proper distinctions, and ascertain from the context, the peculiar meaning and allusion of the inspired writers.

"No truth is more plainly and unequivocally asserted in the Scriptures, than the unity of God. The plainest and most literal passages declare that

God is one. Gal. 3. 20.

There is but one God, the Father. 1 Cor. 8. 6.

There is none other but he. Mark 12. 32.

That we shall worship Jehovah, and him only. Matt. 4. 10.

That the true worshippers shall worship the *Father*. John 4. 23.

And that the apostles bowed their knees *only* to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Eph. 3. 14.

But notwithstanding this, we find men who declare, that there are three distinct and co-equal persons, or Gods, each possessing the attribute ascribed to the Divinity and yet in a mysterious and incomprehensible manner forming but one Being. This is contrary both to reason and scripture. It is so manifestly opposed to the former, and absurdly contradictory in itself, that the advocates of the doctrine are necessitated to fly to their imagined strong hold, which they deem invulnerable; and *it is* invulnerable to those who abandon their reason and common sense. "It is a mystery and above the comprenension of reason." Some truths, we have said, may be *above*, but there are none *contrary to*, reason. The followers of Calvin and other Trinitarians, in order to support their opinions, have been obliged to build up a system, which involves so many contradictions, and presents such a shocking picture of the character of the Divine Being, that as light and knowledge spread in the world, future ages will wonder that such a terrific series of imagery could ever for one moment have been harboured in the bewildered mind of man.

None of the New Testament writers were Trinitarians. And that Jesus, as well as Moses, and all the most celebrated characters, whose histories are recorded in the Bible, was a believer in the sole supremacy of one God, even the Father only, is abundantly evident.

The Trinitarian opinion, to which we have alluded, is not expressed in any one genuine passage throughout the Bible, but gathered by implications directly opposite to their intent to the letter and spirit of those express and exclusive passages, which oppose that opinion, and also to the general tenor of Scripture. Thus of thirteen hundred passages in the New Testament, wherein the word God is mentioned, not *one* of these necessarily implies a plurality of persons. The inferiority of Christ to the Father is deducible from two hundred and forty passages, in which Jesus is noticed in the New Testament. In four hundred and one passages God the Father is so mentioned as to lead to the conclusion that He is supreme.

Jesus Christ, whose authority we *ought*

not to question, never said one word about "the Holy Trinity." This phrase has been invented since his time. He never said that there are "three persons in one God." He never said, that "the Son is God," or that "the Holy Ghost is God." He never said that he had "two natures, the one human and the other divine;" but through the favour of his heavenly Father, he was made largely a partaker of the latter. He plainly taught the people that he was *a man*. "A man," said he, "who hath told you the truth;" but a man to whom "God gave not the spirit by measure." John iii. 34. He confessed, "I can of my own self do nothing. I live by the Father.

Is it not something very extraordinary, upon the supposition of the co-equality of the three persons in the Trinity, that there should be such strong and such numerous passages, that lead to the conclusion of the inferiority and absolute subjection of the Son to the Father, and yet that there should not be *one* passage throughout the Bible, that can in any way induce us to conclude the subordination, real or apparent, of the Father to the Son?

The Athanasians, when hard pressed, have been forced to allow, that there *is* a priority of order and dignity between the Father and the Son, because the Father is unbegotten, though the Son is not: and the Son is said to be commanded and sent, though the Father is not. Is it not therefore absurd to say, that "in this Trinity, none is afore or after other; none is greater or less than another"? The Father must have existed before the Son, and yet the three "substances" are considered co-equal and co-eternal. But common sense will perceive that they could not be joined together to make one before they existed, and they could not exist till the generation of the Son. Yet a popular hymn runs thus:

"That mercy sent the *eternal* Son
To purchase our salvation."

(To be continued.)

"Charity, though not apt to look abroad for faults, is neither blind, nor unfeeling, yet ignorance and indifference are often mistaken for it."—[*Dillwyn.*

The Scriptural account of the Creation.

"When this congeries of elementary principles was brought together," says Adam Clarke, "God was pleased to spend six days in assimilating, assorting, and arranging the materials, out of which he built up, not only the earth, but the whole of the solar system." *Com. on Genesis.*

Not a few, both among the ancients and moderns, even of those who have been ranked with the *orthodox* writers, have objected to a *literal* interpretation of the Mosaic account of the creation. "Whilst it has been a source of doubts and difficulties," says a writer in the *Cyclopædia*, "to the best commentators, it has furnished occasion of indecorous and misapplied raillery and ridicule to the enemies of revealed religion in all ages." In order to meet the objections of such cavillers, and sustain the authenticity of the Scriptures, some of the "best commentators," and most exemplary Christians, have departed from the *literal*, and given an *allegorical* interpretation of such parts as are otherwise obscure and unintelligible: and our principal reason for noticing this subject now, is the clamour that has of late, been raised against some individuals, eminent for their virtue and piety, for endeavouring to exemplify the truth of the apostolic declaration, that "All Scripture is profitable for instruction"—by giving such an exposition of obscure parts, as to render their meaning clear to the human understanding, and at the same time useful and edifying.

The account of the "six days" work, many commentators with Adam Clarke, have construed literally and strictly: But *Philo*, a learned Jew, and who is mentioned by Eusebius "As a man copious in speech, rich in sentiments, and eminent and sublime in his acquaintance with the holy Scriptures," calls it "a piece of rustic simplicity to imagine that God really employed the labour of six days in the production of things"; in which he is followed by Origen, Austin, Ambrose &c. Josephus, also, in the first chapter of his "Jewish Antiquities," intimates that "The story of the creation was of the *al-*

legorical kind." Several modern writers, eminent for talents and piety, have entertained similar views on this subject.

The genius of the Hebrew tongue, which, like all unimproved languages, "abounds in figurative expressions borrowed from sensible objects," and in which their writers freely indulged; the state of the Hebrew people at the time Moses wrote, and the manifest design of the history itself, are so many circumstances pointing to an allegorical interpretation.

One of the chief objects of the Jewish lawgiver, in writing this history was, no doubt, to counteract the impressions and influences of an idolatrous worship by which the Hebrews were surrounded for several centuries, and with which their minds were not a little imbued, as evidently appears by the case of the *golden calf*, and other traits of their after history. In Egypt, "Every thing," to adopt the language of Bossuet, "was God, but God himself and the earth that He had created, in which to manifest his glory, seemed to have been turned into a temple of idols". The people worshipped the sun, moon, and stars; fishes, birds, animals, and even radishes, leeks, and onions!

The inspired historian, therefore, shows, in detail, that all these things were but creatures, the work of an Almighty Being, to whom alone, worship, adoration, and praise were to be offered. But as the history, in this part of it, was thus carefully adapted to the moral state of the Israelites, and the circumstances that surrounded them, there is good reason to presume, that the other parts were also contrived with superior wisdom, and equally adapted to the conceptions of the degraded intellects of an ignorant, uncultivated, and superstitious race; in the same manner as the rituals and ceremonies of their religion were. Moses, in short, has written "In parables," and for the same reason, perhaps, that Jesus Christ spoke in parables; for Moses wrote for "*them that were without*," or for those whose minds were not prepared to receive a literal and philosophical account of the creation, in all its parts.

On the part of those, therefore, who raise a clamour against every attempt to interpret, or to illustrate these "parables" on the creation &c. there is, we think, not only a lack of charity, but of good sense, and consistency. They object that the authenticity of the Scriptures is thus overthrown; but we think that to attempt a satisfactory and instructive interpretation of such parts as "have been a source of doubts and difficulties to the best commentators," and of "raillery and ridicule" to unbelievers, will rather tend to confirm their authenticity than otherwise. With equal reason might they assert that to reject the literal meaning of our Saviour's declaration respecting eating of his flesh, and drinking of his blood, were to deny his veracity. But they accept the latter as a figure, and for the same reason that others do the former—because it is in a literal sense, inexplicable.

CHRISTIAN TOLERATION.

We extract the following from John Griffith's Journal, during his visit to the meetings in England, in the year 1761. It furnishes a trait of that Christian toleration, and regard for the rights and privileges of members, in the application o the discipline as exercised by our ancient friends towards their brethren.

"The 24th (of the second month 1761) we visited those under our profession at Coterhill-head, called a Monthly Meeting; but, alas! upon inquiry, we found but very little done of the business proper to a Monthly Meeting; neither was it held in due course, but rather occasionally, for some particular purposes; and when the state of the members appeared, we did not marvel thereat, seeing *most of them* were unfaithful in regard to that important testimony, against tithes and other antichristian demands of that nature: other *great disorders* also had crept in, nor can any other be reasonably expected, where persons are so void of a right understanding, as to sacrifice that noble testimony; they have not strength to maintain other branches in a consistent efficacious manner, so that where this defection hath prevailed, we have observed the most essential part in religion (amongst us as a people) has fallen with it: meetings for worship and discipline are neglected, and if sometimes held by such, they are to little good purpose

plainness and self-denial are departed from: this hard, dark, tythe paying spirit is so blind, as to see but little in any branch of our testimony, wherein there is a cross to the carnal mind. Upon solid consideration we did not think, that using endeavours to regulate that meeting, in its situation at that time, would answer any good purpose; but the great thing pointed out to us in the light of truth, was its being dissolved, and that the members thereof might be joined to Hertford Monthly Meeting; *which had been endeavoured for several years, both by their Quarterly Meeting, and also several committees of the Yearly Meeting, which had not, till now, proved successful, as the consent of most of the members could not be obtained:* but this meeting, through divine favour, was wonderfully overshadowed with a solemn weight of heavenly power, which awed and tendered their spirits, and at the same time mercifully enabled us clearly to demonstrate, that they contended only for the name of a monthly meeting; seeing the service of such a meeting was not answered, scarcely in any instance. *They at length generally yielded*, and a minute was made to propose a junction with Hertford, which is since effected, to the great ease and satisfaction of Friends. I cannot well avoid remarking here, the very great hurt and obstruction to the progress of truth, which I have divers times, with sorrow of heart, observed to arise by some active members from private views, strenuously withstanding the pointings of Divine wisdom, for the help and preservation of the body, which doubtless is in the Lord's sight, a crime of a very offensive nature; therefore all should greatly dread being in any degree guilty thereof. Let us therefore, at all times, carefully examine what ground we act upon in the church of God, whether we always preserve the single eye, being clothed with that pure charity which seeketh not her own, and filled with that universal spirit, that carefully promotes the good of the whole, without respect of persons."

Let those who have imbibed high ideas of *power*, and *authority*, and who are at this time using it with an outstretched arm against their brethren in the Society of Friends—let these ponder well the foregoing case, and mark the broad difference, both in practice and principle, which it exhibits, when brought into a comparison with their own proceedings, and the motives that govern their conduct.

FOR THE BEREAN.

As a proof of the partiality of some modern English Friends for the writings and doctrines of prelates of the established Church of that country, we may appeal to the writings of Jos. J. Gurney, so well received by many of his brethren. This author quotes and refers to many of the theologians of the establishment, (but not once, we believe, from Fox, Penn, or Barclay!) from Warburton's "Defence of Christianity," with marked approbation; and no doubt he studied him closely. We give below some remarks on Warburton, taken from "Law's Address to the Clergy," which we recommend to J. J. Gurney's consideration.

"What poor Divinity knowledge comes from great scholars and great readers, may be sufficiently seen from the two following judicious quotations, in a late dissertation on Enthusiasm; the one is taken from Dr. Warburton's sermons, the other from a pastoral letter of Mr. Stinstra. That from Dr. Warburton stands thus: 'By them, (that is by the writings of the New Testament) the prophetic promise of our Saviour, that the Comforter should abide forever, was eminently fulfilled. For though his ordinary influence occasionally assists the faithful, yet his constant adode and supreme illumination is in the sacred Scriptures.' Dr. Warburton's doctrine is this: that the inspired books of the New Testament is that Comforter, or Spirit of Truth, or Illuminator, which is meant by Christ's being always with his church. Let us therefore put the Dr.'s doctrine into the letter of the text, which will best show how true or false it is. Our Lord saith, 'It is expedient for you that I go away, or the Comforter will not come:' that is, it is expedient for you that I leave off teaching you in words that sound only in your outward ears, that you may have the same words in writing, for your outward eyes to look upon; for if I do not depart from this vocal way of teaching you, the Comforter will not come,—that is, ye will not have the comfort of my words written on paper. But if I go away, I will send you written books, which will lead you into

such a truth of words, as ye could not have whilst they were only spoken from my mouth; but being written on paper, they will be my spiritual, heavenly, constant abode with you, and the most supreme Illuminator ye can receive from me. [See pp. 51, 52, 53 of Law's Address.] I shall now only add this friendly hint to the Doctor, that he has a remedy at hand in his own sermon, how he may be delivered from thus grossly mistaking the Spirit of the Gospel, as well as the law of Moses. St. Paul, (saith the Doctor) "had a quick and lively imagination, and an extensive, and intimate acquaintance with those matters in moral painting, the Classic writers; *all which he proudly sacrificed to the glory of the everlasting Gospel.*' Now if the Doctor did that, (though it was only from humility) which he says the apostle did *proudly*, such humility might be as great a good to him as that pride was to the Apostle. And indeed, one would have thought, that as soon as the Doctor had discovered these writers to be only great masters in moral painting, it should have had the same effect upon him as if he had found them great masters in delusion; for where there is moral painting, there is moral delusion. And the Spirit, the Life, the purity and divine simplicity of Gospel Truth, is more eluded, lost, and destroyed, by moral painting, whether in books or pulpits, than by any material colouring upon images of wood or clay, to excite spiritual devotion in churches.

"And again, if the everlasting Gospel is now as glorious a thing as it was in St. Paul's days,—if the highest, most accomplished classical knowledge is so unsuitable to the Light and Spirit of the Gospel, how wonderful is it that this should never come into his head, from the beginning to the end of his three long Legation Volumes; or that he should come piping hot with fresh and fresh classic beauties, found out by himself in a Shakespeare, a Pope &c. to preach from the pulpit the divine wisdom of a Paul, in renouncing all his great classic attainments as mere dross and dung, that by so doing he might win Christ, and be found in him."

"Virtue brightens in adversity."

Spiritual Redemption by Christ.

"And the life of Christ as manifest in mortal flesh, hath partaken of the afflictions of the upright in all ages. And the spirit of God is grieved, the just principle oppressed and offended with men's iniquities and transgressions. So Christ, considered as *a seed*, and in that low estate; is capable of being formed in man, both of being raised up in man by the power of the Father, of growing up as a tender plant, and as a root out of dry ground, and so of receiving power and help from him; as indeed every seed that is sown, and every plant that takes root, is capable of receiving virtue and nourishment according to its kind, or else it cannot be quickened to life, grow, or bring forth fruit. And such a growth of the immortal seed was both in Christ and in his people, which must be owned, if the seed of the kingdom within, and the spiritual birth or forming of Christ within, (or he as a seed or plant of renown,) be known and owned, or a suffering, crucifying, dying, and living with Christ be witnessed by man.

"For Christ's suffering, cross, death, resurrection, life, and dominion are spiritually known in the true believer, who is of that seed which Christ took upon him. Yea, his spiritual begetting, spiritual forming in man, and spiritual birth is known within; and all for the redemption and salvation of man to God, or else he falls short of life and glory; and he that brings up the soul out of the horrible pit first descends thither.

"And though it is not true to say, he only comes to redeem, raise up, or save himself; yet it may be truly said, he doth arise to scatter his enemies, and to bring man out of the pit; and in conquering his enemies, his own arm brings salvation to him. Isa. lxiii. 5, 9. And thus saith the Lord: 'In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee; and I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people to establish the earth—that thou mayst say to the prisoners go forth, and to them that sit in darkness, show yourselves;' (Isa. xlix. 8, 9.) which promise is of a general extent.

"So mark here; he that redeemeth the

prisoner, and calleth forth them that are in darkness, he hath his help of God that sent him. We are not to conclude that he helps not others, because he is helped himself. And Christ's sufferings, both inward and outward, (for they were twofold,) were for man's benefit: as is testified in the said book, 'Love to the Lost.' 'The creature is blessed of God for the seed's sake, and redemption from the vain conversation, as Christ gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity,' &c. So if thou wert thus redeemed, thou needst not inquire for the subject of redemption, nor accuse others for owning the seed of God, both in an oppressed state, and as raised up by the eternal power and glory of the Father; for "worthy is the Lamb that was slain from the foundation of the world, to receive power, and wisdom, and glory, and might,' &c.

"Moreover, as the elect seed is spoken of in the scripture, both with respect to Christ the anointed, and with respect to his seed and heritage; so also the seed is Christ, not only as in himself, anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows, but also as in union and conjunction with his church or members. As the body is one, and hath many members, so also is Christ; and so Christ and the body comprehensively are one. He is the Anointed, and we are anointed in him, and he that hath anointed us is God."

Penn's Christian Quaker.

MISCELLANIA.

Emulation.—Emulation has been termed a spur to virtue, and assumes to be a spur of gold. But it is a spur composed of baser materials, and if tried in the furnace, will be found to want that *fixedness* which is the characteristic of gold. He that pursues virtue, only to surpass others, is not far from wishing others less forward than himself; and he that rejoices too much at his own perfections, will be too little grieved at the defects of other men. We might also insist upon this, that true virtue, though the most humble of all things, is the most progressive; it must persevere to the end. But, as Alexander scorned the Olympic games, because there were no kings to contend with, so he that starts only to outstrip others, will suspend his exertions when that is attained; and self-love will, in many cases, incline him to stoop for the prize, even before he has obtained the victory. But the views of the Christian are more extensive and more enduring; his ambition is, not to conquer others, but *himself*, and unbuckles his armour, only for his shroud."

Lacon.

Time.—"Time is the most undefinable of things; the past is gone, the future is not come, and the present becomes the past, even while we attempt to define it, and like the flash of the lightning, at once exists and expires. Time is the measurer of all things, but is itself immeasureable, and the grand discloser of all things, but is itself undisclosed. Like space, it is incomprehensible, because it has no limits, and it would be still more so if it had. It is more obscure in its source than the Nile, and in its termination than the Niger; and advances like the slowest tide, but retreats like the swiftest torrent. gives wings of lightning to pleasure, but feet of lead to pain, and lends expectation a curb, but enjoyment a spur. It robs beauty of her charms, to bestow them on her picture, and builds a monument to merit, but denies it a house; it is the transient and deceitful flatterer of falsehood, but the tried and final friend of truth. Time is the most subtle yet the most insatiable of depradators, and by appearing to take nothing, is permitted to take all, nor can it be satisfied, until it has stolen the world from us, and us from the world. It constantly flies, yet overcomes all things by flight, and although it is the present ally, it will be the future conquerer of death.—Time, the cradle of hope, but the grave of ambition, is the stern corrector of fools, but the salutary counsellor of the wise, bringing all they dread to the one, and all they desire to the other; but like Cassandra, it warns us with a voice that even the sagest discredit too long, and the silliest believe too late. Wisdom walks before it, opportunity with it, and repentance behind it; he that has made it his friend, will have little to fear from his en-

emies, but he that hath made it his enemy, will have little to hope from his friends."

Ib.

French Revolution.—"Dr. Moore, father of the General, was at Paris on the breaking out of the Revolution. He wished to purchase a few of the busts of those demagogues who had, each in their turn, strutted their hour on that bloody stage. 'Ah Sir!' exclaimed the artist, 'ours has has been a losing trade of late; as the real heads have often taken leave of the shoulders of their owners, before the *artificial* ones, which we were modelling, could be exhibited for sale. It then became as dangerous to have them, as before it was to be without them. But here Sir,' said he, handing him the bust of the Abbe Sieyes, 'here is a head that has not yet quarrelled with its shoulders. This head in some degree makes up for what we have lost by its companions; it is in great request yet, and *sells well.*'"—[*Ib.*

From Addison's evidences of the Christian Religion.

The spacious firmanent on high,
With all the blue etherial sky,
And spangled heav'ns, a shining frame,
Their great Original proclaim;
Th' unweary'd sun, from day to day,
Does his Creator's power display
And publishes to ev'ry land
The work of an Almighty hand.

Soon as the ev'ning shades prevail,
The moon takes up the wondrous tale,
And nightly to the list'ning earth
Repeats the story of her birth;
Whilst all the stars that round her burn,
And all the planets in their turn,
Confirm the tidings as they roll,
And spread the truth from pole to pole.

What though, in solemn silence all
Move round the dark terrestrial ball?
What though no real voice nor sound
Amid their radient orbs be found?
In reason's ear they all rejoice,
And utter forth a glorious voice;
For ever singing as they shine;
"The hand that made us is divine"

ADVERTISEMENT.

The Editor of the Berean offers to his subscribers, and others, PROPOSALS, to issue this paper MONTHLY, instead of every two weeks, as hitherto, at one dollar per annum, payable in advance. If no notice be sent him to the contrary, his subscribers will be considered as patrons to the present work, and will be called on accordingly. The Berean, under the proposed modification, will be conducted as heretofore, except that a portion of its columns may be occasionally occupied with a *literary* subject, and with a short summary of such European and Domestic intelligence, as shall be deemed of general interest.

Numbers from the commencement of the work can be furnished to future subscribers.—Remittances made only to B. Webb, or the Editor. Subscriptions not received for less than one year; and if discontinued, notice must be given to the Editor three months before the year expires. Letters must be post-paid.

AGENTS FOR THE BEREAN

WILMINGTON—*Benjamin Webb*, General Agent.
BALTIMORE, Md. *Benjamin Lundy*, editor of the "Genius of Universal Emancipation," No 12, Light street.
DARBY, Pa.—*John H. Andrews.*
CHESTER, Pa.—*Edward Darlington.*
LONDON-GROVE, Pa.—*Wm. Chandler.*
CANTWELL'S BRIDGE, Del—*David Wilson.*
SMYRNA, Del.—*Jacob Pennington*, P. M.
NEW-BRUNSWICK, N. J.—*Robert Bass.*
WAYNESVILLE, O.—*Noah Haines*, P. M
RICHMOND, Ind.—*Robert Morrison*, P. M
WOODBURY, N. J.—*Joseph Saunders*
SALEM, N. J.—*James Wainwright*, Esq.
WRIGHSTOWN, N. J.—*John Pancoast.*
BEAVERDAM, Va.—*T. S. Pleasants*, P. M.
SWEEDSBOROUGH, N. J.—*Joseph Ogden.*
HILLSBOROUGH, Ohio.—*Rob. Way.*
ALEXANDRIA, D. C.—*Wm. Stabler.*
WINCHESTER, Va.—*Dr. Isaac Lamborn*

☞ Subscribers will oblige us by paying up their arrearages, without delay.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.